

The basic difference between our current application and Deo's Patent is that Deo assumes that **ALL DIGITAL DOCUMENTS** in the Smart Card or the Terminal get their certificate from the Certifying Authority. In our current disclosure the user takes different separate digital documents, from different smart cards, and copy them to New (special) Smart Card in a secure method that is the **Novel disclosure** of our current application.

**Arguments in detail:**

**Claim 1:-** The preamble of this independent Claim 1 "A secure method for generating digital documents that are certified by a known authority, comprising the steps of:" is not mentioned or referred to at all in Deo's patent. Deo's patent refers to the issue of "Authentication transactions". The Examiner didn't cite any objection to this basic part of this claim.

Steps A to E of Claim 1 relate to the preamble of Claim 1 which was not rejected. Therefore, Claim 1 as a whole should be allowed.

Furthermore, Claim 1 as a whole provides the method by which an electronic device (i.e. smart card etc.) generates a digital document that by all security means can be construed as being signed by the Certifying Authority (CA) without physically being signed by that CA.

The Examiner's cited references as an objection to this Claim 1, deal with other issues than Claim 1 of our current application.

In Deo's patent Col 4 Ln 63 – Col 5 Ln 4 suggest that the smart card can hold several applications. In no place in Deo's patent it suggests a method **HOW** these applications were introduced to the smart card. Deo's Col 7 Ln 51-63 which was cited by the Examiner clearly state that the "Certifying Authority" **ITSELF** issue the certificate to each application in the smart card and terminal. However, in our current disclosure, **the**

**smart card itself creates the certificate.** Deo's Fig. 4 item 42 is "Terminal Certificate" which was generated by the CA and is transferred to the smart card in order to perform secure communication link between the smart card and the terminal. In our Claim 1. E. we refer to "reading a digital document into the device", i.e. adding to this "electronic device" (smart card) digital documents from other smart cards. Deo's Col 5 Ln 57-Col 6 Ln 14 disclose that **only the CA** issue certificates to each and every application in the smart card or terminal, while our current disclosure calls for physical identification of the owner to the device (smart card), so the smart card is initiated **only once** with that data, and it corresponds to Claim 1.B. This assures that the original "bare" device (smart card) is personalized and initiated to **one specific owner**. Finally, Deo's Col 8 Ln 21-32 deal with the issue of communication between the terminal and smart card. Our Claim 1.E. relate to "Issuing of a digital document signed by the known authority, wherein the document is prepared according to the document issuing method that was programmed into the device in step A" i.e. the smart card **itself** issues this digital document, utilizing the "document issuing method that originates with the known authority" as referred to in Claim 1.A.

**Conclusion:** - Claim 1 deals entirely with other issues that were disclosed by Deo's Patent, and therefore Deo's Patent should not mount any barrier to this current Claim 1.

**Claims 2 – 8:-** These Claims are dependent on Claim 1, and in that context should be allowed. All cited references by the Examiner to Deo's Patent were carefully reviewed and all of them, without exception, do not relate to the context of our disclosure nor to Claims 2 – 8. Therefore, Claims 2 – 8 should be allowed.

**Claim 9:** The preamble of this independent Claim 9 "A device for generating digital documents that are certified by a known authority, comprising:" is not mentioned or referred to at all in Deo's patent. This Claim 9 refers to the "device" (i.e. smart card, smart device etc.) that implements the method disclosed in Claim 1 and Claims 2 – 8. This "device" could be a "standard" smart card, similar to any other smart card and similar to the smart card described in Deo's Fig. 2. However, that is the only similarity to

Deo's disclosure. Deo's disclosure or claims do not disclose any feature for the device that allow the issuance or generation of "**digital documents that are certified by a known authority**".

**Conclusion:** Accordingly, this independent Claim 9 should be allowed, as it was not disclosed or anticipated by Deo.

**Claims 10 – 13:-** These claims are dependent on Claim 9 and in that context should be allowed. All cited references by the Examiner to Deo's Patent were carefully reviewed and all of them, without exception, do not relate to the context of our disclosure nor to Claims 10 - 13. Therefore, Claims 10 - 13 should be allowed.

**Summary:** According to the above, this patent application should be allowed.

**Note:** - The Claims as amended are presented on a clean page attached to this response.

Respectfully submitted,



Elad Barkan

12 Habanin Street, Kefar Sirkin 49935, ISRAEL

[moti@barkan.org](mailto:moti@barkan.org) or [moti@home.barkan.org](mailto:moti@home.barkan.org)